

REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of July 11, 2005.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1-11, 13, 15-16, and 36-40 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,465,307 issued to Azumaya et al. (Azumaya).

Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Azumaya in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,047,955 issued to Shope et al. (Shope).

Claims 12, 17-20, 22-27, and 29-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Azumaya in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,978,791 issued to Farber et al. (Farber).

Claims 21 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Azumaya in view of Farber as applied to claims 17 and 25, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,790,133 issued to Holcomb et al. (Holcomb).

Claim 41 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Azumaya in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,864,408 issued to Kumashiro.

The Art Rejections

Claims 36-40 not Anticipated by Azumaya

With reference to the rejection of independent claim 36, the Office Action states that "Azumaya discloses performing a first-pass processing in a selected direction" with reference to column 14, lines 28-34 and column 15 lines 43-50 of Azumaya. Applicants, however, can find no teaching or suggestion in Azumaya relating to multiple-pass processing. Rather, claim 1 of Azumaya recites "a plurality of image processing devices for processing in parallel said image data from said scan reading means" which apparently teaches away from multiple-pass processing of the image data. On the other hand, two-pass processing of the image data is a significant feature of the present application. For example, referring to page 5, lines 25-31, the present application "overcomes the difficulties of the prior art by the use of an identifier equivalence table that is updated to include a base identifier for each window during the first pass processing of the document. Frequent updating of the identifier equivalence table allows the rapid determination of window locations during the first pass processing of the

document, requiring minimal memory and time.” For this reason, claim 36 recites a limitation for reviewing line segments. Because the step of reviewing line segments occurs in conjunction with the step of associating as recited in the claim, the step of reviewing occurs frequently as described in the above-quoted section of the specification. This feature, as recited in claim 36, is neither taught nor suggested by Azumaya.

Applicants wish to further point out that Azumaya’s teachings require selecting a region of interest (ROI) by enclosing it with a hand-drawn marker (of a certain predefined color hue and texture/density) or by drawing a dot via a control panel designation to enclose a rectangular area of predetermined size. An area recognition process is utilized to generate area flags corresponding to the pixels within the marked area (column 9, lines 47-54). However, in the present application, there is no such requirement of pre-selecting any areas beforehand. For example, there may be several irregularly-shaped photographs or image-objects on one document that are located in various regions of the page as shown in FIG. 1. As recited in claim 36, line segments (20) are formed from neighboring pixels (30) which are then associated for a second-pass processing as described in detail from page 6, line 4 to page 18, line 20. Neither the limitations set forth in claim 36 nor embodiments of the present application require apriori assistance from the user.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 36 and claims 37-40 depending therefrom are not anticipated by Azumaya and are, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Claims 25-27 and 29-35 Patentable over Azumaya in View of Farber

With reference to independent claim 25, the Office Action yet again, as with claim 36, states that “Azumaya discloses a first-pass processing in a selected direction.” As argued above, however, Applicants can find no teaching or suggestion in Azumaya relating to multiple-pass processing. Also, as described with respect to claim 36, two-pass processing of the image data is a significant feature of the present application, and claim 25 clearly recites performing a first pass processing and performing a second pass processing.

Further, as described with reference to claim 36, claim 25 presents no requirement for pre-selecting any areas beforehand which, on the other hand, Azumaya does require. Neither the limitations set forth in claim 25 nor embodiments of the present application require apriori assistance from the user.

Further regarding claim 25, the Office Action makes reference to a second pass processing in Azumaya which Applicants, as previously described, can find no support for in the cited reference.

With reference now to independent claim 30, the Office Action yet again, as with claim 36, states that Azumaya discloses an apparatus adapted to perform a first-pass processing and a second-pass . As argued above, however, Applicants can find no teaching or suggestion in Azumaya relating to multiple-pass processing. Also, as described with respect to claim 36, two-pass processing of the image data is a significant feature of the present application, and claim 30 clearly recites an apparatus adapted to perform a first pass processing and a second pass processing.

Further, as described with reference to claim 36, claim 30 presents no requirement for pre-selecting any areas beforehand which, on the other hand, Azumaya does require. Neither the limitations set forth in claim 30 nor embodiments of the present application require apriori assistance from the user.

Applicants respectfully submit that 25-27, and 29-35 are not obvious in view of Azumaya and Farber. Therefore, claim 25 and claims 26-27 and 29 depending therefrom are in condition for allowance; and claim 30 and claims 31-35 depending therefrom, are also in condition for allowance.

Claim 28 Patentable over Azumaya in View of Farber and Holcomb

As argued above, claim 25 of the present application is not anticipated by Azumaya in view of Farber. Therefore, combining the teachings of Holcomb regarding a ping pong memory with Azumaya and Farber does not produce the invention as recited in claim 28 of the present application.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28, depending from claim 25, is not obvious in view of Azumaya, Farber and Holcomb, and is, therefore, in condition for allowance.

Claim 41 Patentable over Azumaya in View of Kumashiro

As argued above, claim 36 of the present application is not anticipated by Azumaya. Therefore, combining the teachings of Kumashiro regarding processing during the interdocument delay period with Azumaya does not produce the invention as recited in claim 41 of the present application. Applicants respectfully submit that claim 41 depending from claim 36 is not obvious in view of AzumayaFarber and Kumashiro

and, therefore, is in condition for allowance.

No new matter has been added in the current amendments. Claim 35 has been amended only to correct an inadvertent typographical error. Claims 25-41 remain in this application. Claims 1-24 have been canceled.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all claims remaining in the application (Claims 25-41) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this Amendment B. However, the undersigned attorney of record hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Deposit Account No. 24-0037.


In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Mark Svat, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

10/9/05

Date



Mark S. Svat
Reg. No. 34,261
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
(216) 861-5582